

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM H. PUTNAM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 2010

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, January 26, 2010, I was not present for 3 recorded votes. I would have voted the following way: roll No. 17—"yea"; roll No. 18—"yea"; roll No. 19—"yea".

PAYING TRIBUTE TO TRAIL-
BLAZING TUSKEGEE AIRMAN
LEE ARCHER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 2010

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the legacy of Lee Archer, who—despite facing a host of racial injustices—tirelessly defended our Nation as a member of the Tuskegee Airmen, the first African American unit of the U.S. Army Air Corps. Archer died last Wednesday in New York City at the age of 90.

The Harlem-raised Airman is credited with defeating four-and-a-half enemy aircrafts. He has been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with 18 Clusters, the Presidential Unit Citation, and a host of other accolades honoring his service to this country. Most recently, Archer and his fellow Tuskegee Airmen were conferred the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest honor bestowed by Congress.

Before Archer retired from the military in 1970, he flew 169 combat missions—three times the typical number for white pilots—and attained the rank of lieutenant colonel. Archer's deftness at piloting was incontestable; nonetheless, enlisting in the Army Air Corps proved to be no easy feat for him. In 1941, he was rejected from pilot training on the sole basis of his race. Originally deemed too intellectually inept to fly a plane, Blacks were not allowed to join the Army Air Corps until the 1940 appointment of Col. Benjamin O. Davis, Sr., as the Army's first Black brigadier general. Archer graduated from pilot training in 1943 and joined the all-Black Tuskegee Airmen. The experiences of Archer's father, a World War I veteran, taught Archer that willingness to lay down one's life for his country does not necessarily assuage the racism that he faces. In a 2008 interview with the *Journal News*, Archer stated of his father: "he came home from World War I and nothing had changed despite the fact that he fought his butt off for our country."

Lee Archer's devotion to breaking barriers extended far beyond his experiences in the U.S. Military. After retiring from the military in 1970, the New York University-educated Archer was named Corporate Vice President of one of America's most successful companies, General Foods, thereby making Archer one of the first Black executives of a major American corporation. In 1987, his legacy was broadened when he founded Archer Asset Management, a venture capital firm. Archer's successes as an entrepreneur, executive, and serviceman are unparalleled.

Notwithstanding the bigotry and racism that he faced in his attempts to defend his country, Lee Archer became an imperturbable force in the U.S. Military. Archer and his comrades proved that African Americans, too, possess an extraordinary capacity to provide exemplary service to our Nation. Although he was not always able to take advantage of the principles of freedom and equality upon which this Nation was founded, he assiduously defended these principles, and invariably impacted the future of our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 2010

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, on February 2, 2010, I missed roll-call votes 26, 27, and 28. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all.

CONGRESS SHOULD GET A BETTER
HANDLE ON THE EPA**HON. IKE SKELTON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 2010

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, in 2007, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Massachusetts v. EPA* that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, or EPA, had authority under the Clean Air Act to regulate greenhouse gas emissions. Since that time, EPA has been putting in place a framework to do just that.

I do not agree with the Supreme Court. Congress never explicitly granted EPA the authority to regulate greenhouse gases, like carbon dioxide, under the Clean Air Act. That law was enacted years ago and was meant to eliminate lead in the air and to reduce smog.

Because of the Supreme Court's ruling, the EPA has put in motion the process of writing complex rules to regulate emissions from both mobile and stationary sources in the United States—meaning both from automobiles, mobile, and from factories, farms, and power plants, stationary.

I have serious concerns with the powers given to the EPA by the 2007 Supreme Court ruling, and many people in Missouri's Fourth Congressional District share my view, particularly relating to possibly costly regulations of stationary emitters.

In recent years, Congress has been working to get a better handle on EPA and to create a different approach to confronting global climate change, an issue that many scientists and national security experts have concluded could be a real threat to America's long-term domestic and international interests.

In most cases, the discussion in Congress and throughout the country regarding the need for action to slow climate change has been very non-partisan, with Republicans, Democrats, and Independents agreeing that some sort of shift in energy policy should occur. There has been tremendous debate, however, regarding just how best to gain better oversight of EPA while reducing potentially harmful emissions.

After hearing for years from farmers, rural electric cooperative members, and others about their fear of the EPA in this area, I voted in 2009 for legislation that would, among other things, prevent EPA from regulating greenhouse gas emissions on farms and elsewhere and would instead create a market based trading system, called cap and trade, designed to cap these emissions over time.

The legislation that passed in the House, H.R. 2454, the American Clean Energy and Security Act, would also promote homegrown, clean burning renewable fuels by eliminating regulatory requirements at EPA that unfairly restrict renewable energy production in rural America. In particular, it would temporarily stop the EPA from holding U.S. producers responsible for land use changes in other countries, expand the definition of what qualifies as renewable biomass, and include a program to help fund the installation of blender pumps that will help make clean-burning renewable fuels more readily available in America. These provisions are valuable for rural America, which is why it was important to keep this bill moving forward and not to let it die in the House.

I realize H.R. 2454 contained other controversial provisions, some of which I did not support. That is why I pledged at the time to work with my colleagues to refine the bill or to oppose it during final deliberations if that was not possible.

In particular, I was skeptical of the so-called cap and trade system envisioned under H.R. 2454. I have met with Fourth District residents about cap and trade since the vote and am more convinced than ever there is little support for it in my district. In fact, many rural Missourians are downright fearful of the unintended consequences associated with cap and trade.

This year, Congress must set aside cap and trade and instead piece together a scaled back, bipartisan energy bill that gets a better handle on EPA; strengthens America's renewable fuels policies for ethanol, biodiesel, and biomass; encourages responsible domestic exploration of oil and natural gas; expands clean nuclear energy; ensures America's propane industry, which is vital to rural America, remains a key priority; imposes a reasonable renewable electricity standard, with close consultation with utilities, that requires use of renewable fuels in addition to coal and natural gas; and invests in clean energy research and development that will benefit colleges and universities, non-profits, and businesses and allow the United States to become a leader in renewable energy jobs.

Right now, it appears that even a scaled back energy bill is on shaky ground in the Senate. While Senator JEFF BINGAMAN, a Democrat from New Mexico, and Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, a Republican from Alaska, have passed a bipartisan bill out of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, more recent attention has focused on a bill introduced by Senator BARBARA BOXER of California and passed out of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. The more liberal tone of the Boxer legislation has, frankly, alienated conservative Democrats, such as I.

Legislative stalemate combined with aggressive actions by EPA to regulate greenhouse gas emissions without explicit authority from Congress make more urgent Congress' need